

RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Systems, Inc., 730 F.2d 1440, 1984 U.S. App. LEXIS 14873, 221 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 385 (Fed. Cir. 1984)

SHEPARD'S Signal: *Caution: Possible negative treatment*

Restrictions: *Unrestricted*

FOCUS(TM) Terms: *No FOCUS terms*

Print Format: *FULL*

Citing Ref. Signal Legend:

- {Warning} -- negative treatment indicated
- {Questioned} -- validity questioned by citing refs.
- {Caution} -- possible negative treatment
- {Positive} -- positive treatment indicated
- {Analysis} -- cited and neutral analysis indicated
- {Cited} -- citation information available

SHEPARD'S SUMMARY

Unrestricted *Shepard's* Summary

Subsequent appellate history contains possible negative analysis.

Citing References:

Positive Analyses: Followed (3)
Other Sources: Law Reviews (22), Statutes (3), Treatises (20)

LexisNexis Headnotes: HN2 (16), HN3 (2), HN4 (14), HN5 (22), HN6 (46)

PRIOR HISTORY (1 citing reference)

1. *In re Cole Patent Litigation*, 558 F. Supp. 937, 1983 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20301, 217 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 421 (D. Del. 1983){Warning}

Affirmed in part and reversed in part by (CITATION YOU ENTERED):

RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Systems, Inc., 730 F.2d 1440, 1984 U.S. App. LEXIS 14873, 221 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 385 (Fed. Cir. 1984){Caution}

SUBSEQUENT APPELLATE HISTORY (2 citing references)

2. Writ of certiorari dismissed:
Hazeltine Corp. v. RCA Corp., 468 U.S. 1228, 82 L. Ed. 2d 923, 105 S. Ct. 32, 1984 U.S. LEXIS 2882, 53 U.S.L.W. 3160 (1984){Analysis}
3. On remand at:
In re Cole Patent Litigation, 606 F. Supp. 45, 1984 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14691, 225 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 556 (D. Del. 1984){Positive}

CITING DECISIONS (87 citing decisions)

1ST CIRCUIT - U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

4. Cited by:
Omniglow Corp. v. Unique Indus., Inc., 184 F. Supp. 2d 105, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2334 (D. Mass. 2002)

LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN5, HN6{Analysis}

184 F. Supp. 2d 105 p.115

184 F. Supp. 2d 105 p.116

2ND CIRCUIT - U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

5. **Cited by:**
Hunter Douglas, Inc. v. Comfortex Corp., 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22162, 49 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1785 (N.D.N.Y. Dec. 4, 1998) LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN5{Caution}
1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22162
49 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1785 p.1787
6. **Cited by:**
DePaul v. Toshiba Corp., 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11688 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 14, 1995) LexisNexis Headnotes HN4, HN5{Cited}
7. **Cited by:**
Al-Site Corp. v. Opti-Ray Inc., 841 F. Supp. 1318, 1993 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19875, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1915 (E.D.N.Y. 1993) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Warning}
841 F. Supp. 1318 p.1324
8. **Cited by:**
Symbol Technologies, Inc. v. Opticon, Inc., 1990 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5186, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1737 (S.D.N.Y. May 3, 1990) LexisNexis Headnotes HN4{Positive}
9. **Cited by:**
Symbol Technologies Inc. v. Opticon Inc., 17 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1737 (S.D.N.Y. May 3, 1990){Positive}
17 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1737 p.1741
10. **Cited by:**
BOC Group, Inc. v. Novamatrix Medical Systems, Inc., 11 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1853 (D. Conn. May 19, 1989){Warning}
11 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1853 p.1860
11. **Cited by:**
Everpure, Inc. v. Cuno, Inc., 705 F. Supp. 725, 1988 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15567 (D. Conn. 1988){Caution}
705 F. Supp. 725 p.726
12. **Cited by:**
Lemelson v. Synergistics Research Corp., 669 F. Supp. 642, 1987 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8509, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1927 (S.D.N.Y. 1987) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Positive}
669 F. Supp. 642 p.649
13. **Cited by:**
Augat, Inc. v. John Mezzalingua Associates, Inc., 642 F. Supp. 506, 1986 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24221, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1912 (N.D.N.Y. 1986) LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN5{Positive}
642 F. Supp. 506 p.507

3RD CIRCUIT - U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

14. **Followed by:**
Applied Concepts, Inc. v. Olympia Indus., 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25980 (W.D. Pa. May 17, 2001)
LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Analysis}
 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25980

15. **Cited by:**
Evident Corp. v. Church & Dwight Co., 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23231 (D.N.J. Aug. 26, 1999) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Positive}**
 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23231

16. **Cited by:**
Motorola v. Interdigital Tech. Corp., 930 F. Supp. 952, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8673 (D. Del. 1996)
LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Warning}
 930 F. Supp. 952 p.967

17. **Cited by:**
California Medical Prods. v. Tecnol Medical Prods., 921 F. Supp. 1219, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20780 (D. Del. 1995){**Positive**}
 921 F. Supp. 1219 p.1252

18. **Cited by:**
Littelfuse, Inc. v. Bel Fuse, Inc., 21 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1293 (D.N.J. Apr. 26, 1991)
 21 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1293 p.1299

19. **Cited by:**
E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co., 711 F. Supp. 1205, 1989 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4528, 11 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1081 (D. Del. 1989) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN5, HN6{Caution}**
 711 F. Supp. 1205 p.1216

20. **Cited by:**
Johnson & Johnson Consumer Products, Inc. v. Ormco Corp., 1988 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17529 (D. Del. Sept. 29, 1988) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN5{Cited}**

21. **Cited by:**
RCA Corp. v. Data General Corp., 701 F. Supp. 456, 1988 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12244, 8 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1305 (D. Del. 1988) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN4, HN6{Caution}**

22. **Cited by:**
Phillips Petroleum Co. v. United States Steel Corp., 673 F. Supp. 1278, 1987 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10296, 6 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1065 (D. Del. 1987) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN4, HN6{Caution}**
 673 F. Supp. 1278 p.1287
 673 F. Supp. 1278 p.1293

23. **Cited by:**
RCA Corp. v. Data Gen. Corp., 1986 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18486 (D. Del. Oct. 27, 1986) **LexisNexis**

Headnotes HN4

24. Cited by:
Phillips Petroleum Co. v. United States Steel Corp., 616 F. Supp. 335, 1985 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17548, 227 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 164 (D. Del. 1985){Positive}
 616 F. Supp. 335 p.338
25. Cited by:
Mannesmann Demag Corp. v. Engineered Metal Products Co., 605 F. Supp. 1362, 1985 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22091, 226 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 466 (D. Del. 1985) LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN3, HN4{Positive}
 605 F. Supp. 1362 p.1371
26. Cited by:
In re Cole Patent Litigation, 606 F. Supp. 45, 1984 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14691, 225 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 556 (D. Del. 1984) LexisNexis Headnotes HN3, HN4{Positive}

4TH CIRCUIT - U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

27. Cited by:
Leviton Mfg. Co. v. Universal Sec. Instruments, Inc., 304 F. Supp. 2d 726, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2588 (D. Md. 2004) LexisNexis Headnotes HN4, HN6{Cited}
 304 F. Supp. 2d 726 p.748
28. Cited by:
Glaxo, Inc. v. Novopharm, Ltd., 830 F. Supp. 871, 1993 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13928, 29 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1126 (E.D.N.C. 1993) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Caution}
 830 F. Supp. 871 p.874
29. Cited by:
Akzo N.V. v. E. I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co., 635 F. Supp. 1336, 1986 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25155, 230 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 263 (E.D. Va. 1986) LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN5{Positive}
 635 F. Supp. 1336 p.1352

5TH CIRCUIT - U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

30. Cited by:
Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp., 1988 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16086, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1577 (N.D. Tex. Aug. 31, 1988) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Warning}
 9 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1577 p.1597
31. Cited by:
B.W.B. Controls, Inc. v. U.S. Industries, Inc., 626 F. Supp. 1553, 1985 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16500, 228 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 799 (E.D. La. 1985) LexisNexis Headnotes HN4, HN6{Positive}
 626 F. Supp. 1553 p.1568

6TH CIRCUIT - U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

32. Cited by:

Weatherchem Corp. v. J.L. Clark, 937 F. Supp. 1262, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13450 (N.D. Ohio 1996)
LexisNexis Headnotes HN4{Warning}
 937 F. Supp. 1262 p.1288

33. **Cited by:**
Wolstenholme v. Countrymark Coop., 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13506 (S.D. Ohio Apr. 19, 1994) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN5, HN6{Analysis}**
34. **Cited by:**
Continental Can Co. v. Monsanto Co., 1989 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13417, 11 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1761 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 3, 1989) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Warning}**
 11 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1761 p.1764
35. **Cited by:**
Trojan, Inc. v. Shat-R-Shield, Inc., 703 F. Supp. 609, 1988 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15131, 8 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1391 (E.D. Ky. 1988) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Warning}**
 703 F. Supp. 609 p.619
36. **Cited by:**
Carella v. Starlight Archery, 595 F. Supp. 613, 1984 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23245, 224 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 879 (E.D. Mich. 1984) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN4, HN5{Caution}**
 595 F. Supp. 613 p.620

7TH CIRCUIT - U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

37. **Cited by:**
Suncast Corp. v. Avon Plastics, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15222 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 21, 1999) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN2**
 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15222
38. **Followed by:**
Wilson Sporting Goods Co. v. Head Sports, Inc., 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10254 (N.D. Ill. July 2, 1998) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Warning}**
 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10254
39. **Cited by:**
Avery Dennison Corp. v. UCB SA, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5053 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 10, 1998) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN2{Analysis}**
 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5053
40. **Followed by:**
C & F Packing Co. v. IBP, Inc., 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4685 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 30, 1998) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN2{Warning}**
 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4685
41. **Cited by:**
Undersea Breathing Sys. v. Nitrox Techs., 985 F. Supp. 752, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19065 (N.D. Ill. 1997)

LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Warning}

985 F. Supp. 752 p.773

42. **Cited by:**
Abbott Lab. v. Diamedix Corp., 969 F. Supp. 1064, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7433, 43 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1448 (N.D. Ill. 1997) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Caution}**
969 F. Supp. 1064 p.1070
43. **Cited by:**
Endress + Hauser, Inc. v. Hawk Measurement Sys. Pty., 892 F. Supp. 1107, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9010 (S.D. Ind. 1995) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN5, HN6{Caution}**
892 F. Supp. 1107 p.1118
892 F. Supp. 1107 p.1119
44. **Cited by:**
Great N. Corp. v. Henry Molded Prods., 864 F. Supp. 865, 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13885 (E.D. Wis. 1994) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN2{Analysis}**
864 F. Supp. 865 p.870
45. **Cited by:**
Estate of Stoller v. Ford Motor Co., 784 F. Supp. 506, 1992 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 98, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1263 (N.D. Ill. 1992) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Analysis}**
784 F. Supp. 506 p.517
46. **Cited by:**
Estate of Stoller v. Ford Motor Co., 711 F. Supp. 1451, 1989 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 4123, 12 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1197 (N.D. Ill. 1989) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Warning}**
711 F. Supp. 1451 p.1457
47. **Cited by:**
Whistler Corp. v. Dynascan Corp., 1989 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1513 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 9, 1989) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN5{Positive}**
48. **Cited by:**
Consolidated Aluminum Corp. v. Foseco International, Ltd., 1988 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16911, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1143 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 31, 1988) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Warning}**
10 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1143 p.1164
49. **Cited by:**
FMC Corp. v. Manitowoc Co., 654 F. Supp. 915, 1987 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1413, 1987-1 Trade Cas. (CCH) P67503, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1969 (N.D. Ill. 1987) **LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN5{Positive}**
654 F. Supp. 915 p.931

8TH CIRCUIT - U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

50. **Cited by:**
AgriChem, Inc. v. Loveland Indus., 843 F. Supp. 520, 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1148, 31 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA)

1282 (D. Minn. 1994) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Positive}
843 F. Supp. 520 p.529

51. Cited by:
Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc., 1991 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14823 (D. Minn. Apr. 30, 1991) LexisNexis Headnotes HN5{Positive}
52. Cited by:
Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc., 1991 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11451 (D. Minn. Apr. 30, 1991) LexisNexis Headnotes HN5{Caution}
53. Cited by:
H.H. Robertson Co. v. Mac-Fab Products, Inc., 711 F. Supp. 970, 1988 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16428 (E.D. Mo. 1988) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Cited}
711 F. Supp. 970 p.975

9TH CIRCUIT - U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

54. Cited by:
Asyst Techs., Inc. v. Empak, Inc., 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26418 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 8, 2003) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Warning}
2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26418
55. Cited by:
Digital Control Inc. v. McLaughlin Mfg. Co., 248 F. Supp. 2d 1019, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8580 (W.D. Wash. 2003) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Analysis}
248 F. Supp. 2d 1019 p.1021
56. Cited by:
Telemac Corp. v. US/Intelicom, Inc., 185 F. Supp. 2d 1068, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23532 (N.D. Cal. 2001) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Caution}
185 F. Supp. 2d 1068 p.1078
57. Cited by:
Bonanza Press, Inc. v. Douglas Press, Inc., 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21959 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 17, 2000) LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN5{Cited}
2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21959
58. Cited by:
S3 Inc. v. nVidia Corp., 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23218 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 16, 1999) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6
1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23218
59. Cited by:
Advanced Cardiovascular Sys. v. Scimed Life Sys., 63 F. Supp. 2d 1064, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9753 (N.D. Cal. 1999) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Caution}
63 F. Supp. 2d 1064 p.1071

60. Cited by:
Ultra-Tex Surfaces, Inc. v. Hill Bros. Chem., 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22993 (C.D. Cal. July 7, 1998) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Caution}
61. Cited by:
Teradyne, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co., 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8630 (N.D. Cal. June 21, 1994) LexisNexis Headnotes HN4, HN5{Caution}
62. Cited by:
Teradyne, Inc. v. Hewlett-Packard Co., 1993 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14601 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 7, 1993) LexisNexis Headnotes HN2{Caution}
63. Cited by:
Mark Industries v. Mobile Scaffolding Management & Sales, Inc., 1989 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16267, 12 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1849 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 14, 1989) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Analysis}
12 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1849 p.1858
64. Cited by:
Fortel Corp. v. Phone-Mate, Inc., 1987 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10756, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1081 (C.D. Cal. July 29, 1987){Warning}
5 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1081 p.1084

10TH CIRCUIT - U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

65. Cited by:
Micro Chem. v. Great Plains Chem. Co., 900 F. Supp. 1386, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13115 (D. Colo. 1995) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Warning}
900 F. Supp. 1386 p.1402
66. Cited by:
Halliburton Co. v. Western Co. of North America, 1989 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16942, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1973 (W.D. Okla. Jan. 27, 1989){Caution}
10 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1973 p.1979
67. Cited by:
Halliburton Co. v. Western Co. of North America, 1988 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15711, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1973 (W.D. Okla. Nov. 3, 1988) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Positive}
68. Cited by:
Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Research Medical, Inc., 679 F. Supp. 1037, 1987 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12749, 6 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1401 (D. Utah 1987){Analysis}
679 F. Supp. 1037 p.1056

11TH CIRCUIT - U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

69. Cited by:
Default Proof Credit Card Sys. v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc., 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 28082 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 30, 2004) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Positive}
2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 28082

D.C. CIRCUIT - U.S. DISTRICT COURT

70. Cited by:
Sigma-Tau Industrie Farmaceutiche Riunite, S.P.A. v. Lonza, Ltd., 62 F. Supp. 2d 70, 1999 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13888 (D.D.C. 1999) LexisNexis Headnotes HN5, HN6{Analysis}
 62 F. Supp. 2d 70 p.85

FEDERAL CIRCUIT - COURT OF APPEALS

71. Cited by:
Ecolchem, Inc. v. Southern Cal. Edison Co., 1996 U.S. App. LEXIS 13330 (Fed. Cir. June 5, 1996) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Analysis}
72. Cited by:
In re Sun, 1993 U.S. App. LEXIS 34020, 31 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1451 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 23, 1993) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Analysis}
 31 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1451 p.1453
73. Cited by:
In re Weiss, 1993 U.S. App. LEXIS 2517, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1885 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 8, 1993) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Analysis}
 26 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1885 p.1886
74. Cited by:
In re Runion, 1993 U.S. App. LEXIS 1945 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 1, 1993) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6
75. Cited by:
Symbol Technologies, Inc. v. Opticon, Inc., 935 F.2d 1569, 1991 U.S. App. LEXIS 12233, 19 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1241, 33 Fed. R. Evid. Serv. (CBC) 1381 (Fed. Cir. 1991) LexisNexis Headnotes HN5{Caution}
 935 F.2d 1569 p.1580
76. Cited by:
Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc., 927 F.2d 1565, 1991 U.S. App. LEXIS 3925, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Caution}
 927 F.2d 1565 p.1576
77. Cited by:
RCA Corp. v. Data General Corp., 887 F.2d 1056, 1989 U.S. App. LEXIS 15538, 12 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1449 (Fed. Cir. 1989){Caution}
78. Cited by:
Jackson Jordan, Inc. v. Plasser American Corp., 824 F.2d 977, 1987 U.S. App. LEXIS 244 (Fed. Cir. 1987) LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN5{Analysis}
79. Cited by:
Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc., 806 F.2d 1565, 1986 U.S. App. LEXIS 20410, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Questioned}
 806 F.2d 1565 p.1574

80. Cited by:
Carella v. Starlight Archery & Pro Line Co., 804 F.2d 135, 1986 U.S. App. LEXIS 20373, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1209, 231 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 644 (Fed. Cir. 1986) LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN5{Caution}
804 F.2d 135 p.138
81. Cited by:
Structural Rubber Products Co. v. Park Rubber Co., 749 F.2d 707, 1984 U.S. App. LEXIS 15223, 223 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1984) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Caution}
749 F.2d 707 p.715
82. Cited by:
Jervis B. Webb Co. v. Southern Systems, Inc., 742 F.2d 1388, 1984 U.S. App. LEXIS 15170, 222 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 943 (Fed. Cir. 1984) LexisNexis Headnotes HN4{Caution}
742 F.2d 1388 p.1392
83. Cited by:
Pennwalt Corp. v. Akzona, Inc., 740 F.2d 1573, 1984 U.S. App. LEXIS 15168, 222 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 833 (Fed. Cir. 1984) LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN5{Caution}
740 F.2d 1573 p.1579
84. Cited by:
Radio Steel & Mfg. Co. v. MTD Products, Inc., 731 F.2d 840, 1984 U.S. App. LEXIS 14885, 221 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 657 (Fed. Cir. 1984) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Caution}
731 F.2d 840 p.845

FEDERAL CLAIMS COURT

85. Cited by:
Chem. Separation Tech., Inc. v. United States, 51 Fed. Cl. 771, 2002 U.S. Claims LEXIS 52, 63 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1114 (2002){Analysis}
51 Fed. Cl. 771 p.813
86. Cited by:
Executors of the Estate of Wicker v. United States, 43 Fed. Cl. 172, 1999 U.S. Claims LEXIS 52 (1999) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Positive}
43 Fed. Cl. 172 p.181
87. Cited by:
Messerschmidt v. United States, 29 Fed. Cl. 1, 1993 U.S. Claims LEXIS 104 (1993) LexisNexis Headnotes HN6{Positive}
29 Fed. Cl. 1 p.21
88. Cited by:
Standard Mfg. Co. v. United States, 25 Cl. Ct. 1, 1991 U.S. Cl. Ct. LEXIS 609 (1991) LexisNexis Headnotes HN2, HN4, HN5{Positive}

25 Cl. Ct. 1 p.50

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

89. Cited by:
Bamberger v. Cheruvu, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1523 (Bd. Pat. App. & Interferences Feb. 18, 1998){Cited}
55 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1523 p.1534
90. Cited by:
Ex parte Ohshiro, 14 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1750 (Bd. Pat. App. & Interferences Feb. 8, 1990)
14 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1750 p.1753

ANNOTATED STATUTES (3 Citing Statutes)

91. 35 USCS @ 102
92. 35 USCS @ 103
93. 35 USCS @ 282

LAW REVIEWS AND PERIODICALS (22 Citing References)

94. ARTICLE: ECHOES OF SCIENTIFIC TRUTH IN THE HALLS OF JUSTICE: THE STANDARDS OF REVIEW APPLIED BY THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT IN PATENT-RELATED MATTERS, 48 Am. U.L. Rev. 1233 (1999)
48 Am. U.L. Rev. 1233 p.1233
95. A REVIEW OF RECENT DECISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT: NOTE: PANDUIT CORP. v. DENNISON MANUFACTURING CO.: DE NOVO REVIEW AND THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT'S APPLICATION OF THE CLEARLY ERRONEOUS STANDARD. *, 36 Am. U.L. Rev. 963 (1987)
96. A REVIEW OF RECENT DECISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT: CASENOTE: KIMBERLY-CLARK CORP. V. JOHNSON & JOHNSON: PRIOR WORK AND PRIOR ART IN OBVIOUSNESS DETERMINATIONS., 34 Am. U.L. Rev. 779 (1985)
97. ESSAY: Judicial Hyperactivity: The Federal Circuit's Discomfort with its Appellate Role, 15 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 725 (2000)
98. FOREWORD: SYMPOSIUM ON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW THEORY *, 68 Chi.-Kent. L. Rev. 585 (1993)
68 Chi.-Kent. L. Rev. 585 p.585
99. NOTE: STAYING PATENT VALIDITY LITIGATION PENDING REEXAMINATION: WHEN SHOULD COURTS ENDEAVOR TO DO SO?, 41 Clev. St. L. Rev. 315 (1993)
100. ARTICLE: BREAKING NEW GROUNDS IN ADMINISTRATIVE REVOCATION OF U.S. PATENTS: A PROPOSITION FOR OPPOSITION - AND BEYOND *, 14 Santa Clara Computer & High Tech. L.J. 63 (1998)

101. *ARTICLE: Walter K. Stapleton – A Consummate Judge of Intellectual Property Matters*, 6 Del. L. Rev. 293 (2003)
102. *NOTE: THE PRECLUSIVE EFFECT OF STATE COURT ADJUDICATION OF PATENT ISSUES AND THE FEDERAL COURTS' CHOICE OF PRECLUSION LAWS*, 69 Fordham L. Rev. 707 (2000)
69 Fordham L. Rev. 707 p.707
103. *ARTICLE: The Hydra of Identity Tolerance: Patent Law Heresies Involving 35 U.S.C. 102*, 85 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 639 (2003)
85 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 639 p.649
104. *ARTICLE: Patenting E-Commerce Inventions: Perspective From an Administrative Patent Judge*, 85 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 447 (2003)
85 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 447 p.462
105. 77 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 1
77 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 1 p.31
106. 76 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 625
76 J. Pat. & Trademark Off. Soc'y 625 p.643
107. *COMMENT: Eat Your Vegetables and Be Sued for Patent Infringement*, 32 McGeorge L. Rev. 957 (2001)
32 McGeorge L. Rev. 957 p.957
108. *NOTE: The Patentability of Software Data Structures After Lowry and Warmerdam*, 32 New Eng.L. Rev. 899 (1998)
109. *LISTENING TO ZANTAC: THE ROLE OF NON-PRESCRIPTION DRUGS IN HEALTH CARE REFORM AND THE FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM*, 62 Tenn. L. Rev. 107 (1994)
110. *ARTICLE: The Economics of Improvement in Intellectual Property Law*, 75 Tex. L. Rev. 989 (1997)
75 Tex. L. Rev. 989 p.1001
111. *ARTICLE: LOOKING FOR FIRE AMIDST THE SMOKE - IS THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT REALLY EXCEEDING ITS APPELLATE AUTHORITY IN PATENT INFRINGEMENT CASES?*, 12 U. Balt. Intell. Prop. L.J. 1 (2003)
112. *ARTICLE: THE NEXT BATTLE: NEW FORMS OF SOFTWARE PRIOR ART*, 2 U. Balt. Intell. Prop. L.J. 115 (1994)
113. *TENTH ANNUAL CORPORATE LAW SYMPOSIUM: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: ARTICLE: WHEN PATENTS ARE BROADENED MIDSTREAM: A COMPROMISE SOLUTION TO PROTECT COMPETITORS AND EXISTING USERS*, 66 U. Cin. L. Rev. 7 (1997)
66 U. Cin. L. Rev. 7 p.7
114. *NOTE: A PROPOSAL TO VIEW PATENT CLAIM NONOBVIOUSNESS FROM THE POLICY*

PERSPECTIVE OF FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 52(A), 20 U. Mich. J.L. Reform 1157 (1987)

115. *NOTE: A PROPOSAL TO VIEW PATENT CLAIM NONOBVIOUSNESS FROM THE POLICY PERSPECTIVE OF FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 52(A)*, 20 U. Mich. J.L. Reform 1157 (1987)

TREATISE CITATIONS (20 Citing Sources)

- 116. *1-3 Chisum on Patents @ 3.02*
- 117. *2-5 Chisum on Patents @ 5.05*
- 118. *2-5 Chisum on Patents @ 5.06*
- 119. *6-19 Chisum on Patents @ 19.05*
- 120. *11 Chisum on Patents @ 1000*
- 121. *11 Chisum on Patents @ 1000 (Cont)*
- 122. *16-4 Chisum on Patents @ R*
- 123. *1-6 CAFC: Practice & Procedure @ 6.06*
- 124. *1-4 E-Commerce and Communications @ 4.02*
- 125. *9-52 Government Contracts: Law, Admin & Proc @ 52.150*
- 126. *1-2 Intellectual Property Counseling & Litigation @ 2.01*
- 127. *2-8 Milgrim on Licensing @ 8.58*
- 128. *3-10 Milgrim on Trade Secrets @ 10.01*
- 129. *1-1 PATENT LAW DIGEST 1200*
- 130. *1-1 PATENT LAW DIGEST 1500 (Cont)*
- 131. *1-3 PATENT LAW DIGEST Scope (Cont)*
- 132. *1-2 Patent Law Perspectives @ 2.2*
- 133. *1-2 Patent Licensing Transactions @ 2.02*
- 134. *1-VI Patent Office Rules and Practice Rule 78*
- 135. *2-VIII Patent Office Rules and Practice Rule 106*